FROM : Henri

RECEIVED

FAX NO. : CENTRAL FAX CENTER Oct. 23 2006 08:53AM P1

OCT 2 3 2006

Henri Duong 316 1/2 E Glendon way Alhambra, CA-91801

October 23, 2006

Ref: Application no. 10/725,226 filing date: 12/01/2003 Art Unit no. 3683 Title: Back driving automatic brake system & Automatic braking system for equipping in all vehicles, airplanes, ships, etc.

Attn: Mr. Cliff Congo; Attorney Office of Petitions United States Patent & Trademark Office Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Fax # 571.273.8300

Dear Mr. Cliff Congo,

In reply to your letter of October 16, 2006, I am referring to "Advisory Action before the filing of an Appeal Brief" was mailed on February 14, 2006 (its copies enclosed) that applicant must timely filed one of the following replies:

- 1. an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance.
- 2. a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37CR41.31, or
- 3. a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37CR1.114.

"Affidavit" belongs one of the documents that your office action required to be filed so applicant filed with an "affidavit" being timely sent on February 17, 2006.

I refer to General Information Concerning "Patent Regulations" published by United States Patent & Trademark Office (see its copy) that Time for Response and Abandonment: " If no reply is received within the time period, the application is considered as abandoned and no longer pending". In the case, the applicant made his reply timely on February 17, 2006 so it makes no reason why the application was considered as abandoned.

In reply to your Notice of Abandonment of August 07, 2006, the applicant filed an amendment of August 29, 2006 reaching your office on September 01, 2006 that new subject matter was removed in the claims as requested by the examiner, which places the application in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, delaying approval of the patent application will cause:

Annaham lives are lesting dally caused by traffic archibads, burnoully value of the oversions will do to save them.

- FROM : Henri
- the invention concerns everylardy who drives including your office employees who should protect thouselves lawfully as the invention makes to avert from any unexpected traffic accidents.
- delaying to benefit in priority a merit progress for the United States among other nations.
- delaying to benefit American interests on job employment as execution of the invention will create immense jobs.
- 5. delaying to benefit American interests on export business lessening foreign debts of the United States as marketing of American new cars with automatic broking device will do to augment for export.

Since the inventor(s) has made an invention earning important profits for a country without reward, it is unfair for him to afford any extra (late) fee, etc as a sort of posselty on which the laws apply. On the other hand, the laws make profits on his invention at the later stage by collecting taxes on inventive products from production line to any market places.

The applicant hereby requests that United States Fatent & I rademark Office withdraws the holding of abandonment of the application for no fee.

Respectfully,

Henri Duong

PAGE 315 * RCVD AT 10/23/2006 12:44:37 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1116 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):05-52



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSONER POR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Versicia 22313-1450

PPLICATION NO.	PILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTUR	ATTURNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/725,226	12/01/2003	Henri Duong	2109	
759	90 02/14/2006		EXAM	NER
HENRI DUONG 316 1/2 E. GLENDON WAY			SICONOLFI, ROBERT	
ALHAMBRA, CA 91801			ARTUNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3683	
			DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006	i

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

6 * DNIS:2738300 * CSIB: * DURATION (mm-ss):05-52	i sasarcanou no: Nr.98X93-0792V:AV2 * (amii higilyad ma	 See 415
Advisory Action	10/725,226	OUONG. HENRI
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert A. Siconoffi	3683
-The Mailing date of this communication appe	ears on the cover chect with the c	eerrospendanso address —
	Robert A. Stoonoffi Pers on the cover elect with the expert on the cover elect with the expectation in Condition Form the same day as filing a Notice of Wing replies: (1) an amendment, shotice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in occ with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply make the final rejection. Advisory Action, or (2) the date sat forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (n) ONLY CHECK BLOK (n) WHEN THE (NO.0017). In or which the petition under 37 CFR 1.14 the shortened statutory parted for reply origing than three months after the mailing day of the thing within the date of filing a brief of the first the mailing day of the first the months after the mailing day of the first the mailing day of the first the date of filing a brief of the date of filing a brief of the first the firs	3683 369770596neloneo acidreso — RALLOWANCE. Appeal. To avoid abandonment of fidevit or other evidence, which compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) ust be filed within one of the following in the final rejection, whichever is later. In a date of the final rejection. FERRAT REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN PRINTER IN THE APPLY WAS FILED WITHIN 1936(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the final rejection, even if the printing set in the final Office action; or (2) as the of the final rejection, even if the provided, of the date of the appeal. Since of CFR +1.37(a). The will not be entered because of CFR +1.37(a). The will not be entered because of the strength of the date of the appeal. Since of CFR +1.37(a). The will not be entered because of the appeal of the date of the appeal
	•	Roboth legent 2/0/20
		Robert A. Siconoffi Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3683
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office TOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) Artigany Action Sectors	the Filing of an Appeal Edgi	Part of Paper No. 20060707

FAX NO. :

General Information Concerning Patents

TIME FOR REPLY AND **ABANDONMENT**

The reply of an applicant to an action by the Office must be made within a prescribed time limit. The maximum period for reply is set at six months by the statute which also provides that the Director may shorten the time for reply to not less than 30 days. The usual period for reply to an Office action is three months. A shortened time for reply may be extended up to the maximum six-month period. An extension of time fee is normally required to be paid if the reply period is extended. The amount of the fee is dependent upon the length of the extension. Extensions of time are generally not available after on application has been allowed. If no reply is received within the time period, the application is considered as abandoned and no longer pending. However, if it can be shown that the failure to prosecute was unavoidable or unintentional, the application may be revived by the Director. The revival requires a petition to the Director, and a fee for the petition, which must be filed without delay. The proper reply must also accompany the petition if it has not yet been filed.

APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES AND TO THE COURTS

If the examiner persists in the rejection of any of the claims in an application, or if the rejection has been made final, the applicant may appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences consists of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the USPTO, the Commissioner for Patents, and the administrative patent judges, but normally each appeal is heard by only three members. An appeal fee is required and the applicant must file a brief to support his/her position. An oral hearing will be held if requested upon payment of the specified fee.

As an alternative to appeal, in situations where an. applicant desires consideration of different claims or further evidence, a request for continued examination (RCE) or continuation application is often filed. The RCE requires a fee and a submission (reply) that continues prosecution, on filing of the RCE. The continuation application is a new application which requires a filing fee and the applicant should include the claims and evidence for which further consideration is desired. If it is filed before expiration of the period for appeal and specific reference is made therein to the earlier application. applicant will be entitled to the earlier filing date for subject matter common to both applications. A continuation application may also be filed as a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) by submitting a request and the appropriate fee, but only if the earlier application has a filing date before May 29, 2000.

If the decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is still adverse to the applicant, an appeal may be taken to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or a civil action may be filed against the Director in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit will review the record made in the Office and may affirm or reverse the Office's action. In a civil action, the applicant may present testimony in the court, and the court will make a decision.

INTERFERENCES

Occasionally two or more applications are filed by different inventors claiming substantially the same patentable invention. The patent can only be granted to one of them, and a proceeding known as an "interference" is instituted by the Office to determine who is the first inventor and entitled to the patent. About one percent of the applications filed become involved in an interference proceeding. Interference proceedings may also be instituted between an application and a patent already issued, provided that the putent has not been issued, nor the application been published, for more than one year prior to the filing of the conflicting application, and provided also that the conflicting application is not barred from being patentable for some other reason.